

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1, 8, 15, 25-30, 33-38 and 41-46 are pending.

Rejection of the claims

The most recent Office Action rejected claims 1, 8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,356,922 (“Schilit”).

Claim 1 recites:

1. A method performed by a computer system, comprising:
storing an electronic version of a paper, wherein the electronic version is displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper;
detecting content of a first portion of the likeness; and
after the detecting of the content, and in response thereto, forming a hyperlink reference and embedding the hyperlink reference within at least part of the content of the first portion of the likeness, wherein the hyperlink reference is associated with a second portion of the likeness, such that when the first portion of the likeness is displayed on the display device, at least a portion of the content is selectable by a user to cause the computer system to display the second portion of the likeness on the display device, and wherein the content is at least one of the following: a term that indicates a location at which the second portion of the likeness is located within the paper; and a phrase that indicates the location.

Claim 8 recites:

8. A system, comprising:
a computing device for:
storing an electronic version of a paper, wherein the electronic version is
displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper;
detecting content of a first portion of the likeness; and
after the detecting of the content, and in response thereto, forming a hyperlink
reference and embedding the hyperlink reference within at least part of
the content of the first portion of the likeness, wherein the hyperlink
reference is associated with a second portion of the likeness, such that
when the first portion of the likeness is displayed on the display
device, at least a portion of the content is selectable by a user to cause
the computing device to display the second portion of the likeness on
the display device, and wherein the content is at least one of the
following: a term that indicates a location at which the second portion
of the likeness is located within the paper; and a phrase that indicates
the location.

Claim 15 recites:

15. A computer program product stored on a tangible computer-readable medium,
comprising:
a computer program processable by a computer system for causing the computer
system to:
store an electronic version of a paper, wherein the electronic version is
displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper;
detect content of a first portion of the likeness; and
after the detecting of the content, and in response thereto, form a hyperlink
reference and embed the hyperlink reference within at least part of the
content of the first portion of the likeness, wherein the hyperlink
reference is associated with a second portion of the likeness, such that
when the first portion of the likeness is displayed on the display
device, at least a portion of the content is selectable by a user to cause
the computer system to display the second portion of the likeness on
the display device, and wherein the content is at least one of the
following: a term that indicates a location at which the second portion
of the likeness is located within the paper; and a phrase that indicates
the location.

In MPEP § 2131, the PTO provides that:

"[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim...."

Therefore, to sustain a rejection of claim 1, Schilit must contain all of the above-recited elements in claim 1. However, Schilit fails to teach the combination of elements in claim 1. In fact, Schilit teaches away from such a combination.

For example, in applying Schilit to claim 1, the Office Action states that Schilit detects an annotation. However, contrary to claim 1, Schilit teaches (at col. 6, lines 1-4), "If the link corresponds to a target portion that is related to the context of a particular annotation then the *link is displayed in a margin* adjacent to the annotation as a *margin representation 34 as shown in FIG. 2*" (emphasis added). As shown in Fig. 2, the margin representation 34 is *not* embedded within the annotation. Instead, the margin representation 34 is merely displayed in the *margin*, where *no* content was previously displayed. By comparison, claim 1 requires: (a) detecting *content* of a first portion of the likeness; and (b) after the detecting of the content, and in response thereto, forming a hyperlink reference and embedding the hyperlink reference *within at least part of the content* of the first portion of the likeness.

Accordingly, Schilit fails to support a rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). In relation to claims 8 and 15, Schilit is likewise defective in supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Moreover, as stated in MPEP § 2142, "...The examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any prima facie conclusion of obviousness. If the examiner does not produce a prima facie case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness..." Also, MPEP § 2142 states: "...the examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical 'person of ordinary skill in the art' when the invention was unknown and just before it was made...The examiner must put aside knowledge of the applicant's disclosure, refrain from using hindsight, and consider the subject matter claimed 'as a whole.'" Further, MPEP § 2143.01 states: "The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination."

In relation to claim 1, Schilit is defective in establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. As between Schilit and Applicant's specification, only Applicant's specification teaches the combination of elements in claim 1. In fact, Schilit teaches away from such a combination. Accordingly, the PTO's burden of factually supporting a prima facie case of obviousness has not been met.

In relation to claims 8 and 15, Schilit is likewise defective in establishing a prima facie case of obviousness.

Thus, a rejection of claims 1, 8 and 15 is not supported.

Conclusion

For these reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1, 8 and 15.

Dependent claims 25-30 depend from and further limit claim 1 and therefore are allowable.

Dependent claims 33-38 depend from and further limit claim 8 and therefore are allowable.

Dependent claims 41-46 depend from and further limit claim 15 and therefore are allowable.

To the extent that this Accompanying Amendment results in additional fees, the Commissioner is authorized to charge deposit account no. 50-3524.

An early formal notice of allowance of claims 1, 8, 15, 25-30, 33-38 and 41-46 is requested.

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. If any unresolved aspect remains, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Davis, Jr.
Registration No. 35,488

Date: October 30, 2007
Davis Law Group, P.C.
6836 Bee Caves Road
Suite 220
Austin, TX 78746
Telephone 512-306-8324
Facsimile 512-306-8374
Docket Number: 1005.7